

<b>SECTION M</b>	1
<b>EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD</b>	1
<b>M.1 Evaluation of Proposals (Sep 2003)</b>	1
<b>M.2 Basis of Contract Award</b>	2
<b>M.3 Cost and Fee Evaluation Criteria</b>	5

## **SECTION M**

### **EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

#### **M.1 Evaluation of Proposals (Sep 2003)**

- (a) This acquisition will be conducted pursuant to the policies and procedures in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) Part 915. DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted for this acquisition.
- (b) The instructions set forth in Section L are designed to provide guidance to the offeror concerning the documentation that will be evaluated by the SEB. The offeror must furnish specific information in its response to adequately address the evaluation criteria. Cursory responses or responses which merely repeat or reformulate the statement of work are not acceptable.
- (c) A proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before the initial ratings if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the RFP, or if it clearly demonstrates that the offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. In the event that a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.
- (d) Prior to an award, a determination shall be made whether any possible Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) exists with respect to the apparent successful offeror or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflict exists. In making this determination, DOE will consider the representation required by Section K of this solicitation. An award will be made if there is no OCI or if any potential OCI can be appropriately avoided or mitigated.
- (e) If a competitive range is established pursuant to 15.306(c), the Contracting Officer's determination of competitive range for proposals submitted as a result of this solicitation will consider such factors as technical evaluation/ranking of the proposal, initial cost/price proposed, most probable cost and other items set forth in this section. Offerors are hereby advised that only those proposals deemed to have a reasonable chance for award of a contract will be

included in the competitive range. Offerors who are not included in the competitive range will be promptly notified.

- (f) For the purpose of evaluating information on an offeror's experience and past performance, an offeror shall be defined as those companies which have established business arrangements or relationships for this solicitation, including subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the statement of work. DOE may contact some or all of the references provided by the offeror, and may solicit past performance information from other available sources.
- (g) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms for both a technical and cost standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.
- (h) Any exceptions or deviations to the terms of the solicitation may make the offer unacceptable for award. If an offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract, the Government may make an award without discussions to another offeror that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the solicitation.
- (i) An overall rating of unsatisfactory in one evaluation criterion may result in elimination of the proposal from further consideration regardless of the rating of the other criteria or subcriteria. An overall criterion rating of unsatisfactory may result from one subcriterion within a criterion being rated unsatisfactory, or from more than one subcriteria within a criterion being rated marginal.

## **M.2 Basis of Contract Award**

The Government intends to award two (2) contracts resulting from this solicitation – one for Portsmouth and one for Paducah - to the responsible offeror(s) whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and is determined to be the best value to the Government. Selection will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each offeror's proposal against the evaluation criteria described below. The technical / business management proposal evaluation criteria are significantly more important than evaluated cost and fee. Evaluated cost and fee will not be point scored. In determining the best value, the Government will assess whether the strengths and

weaknesses between or among competing technical / business management proposals indicates a superiority from the standpoint of: (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated cost and fee to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference. The Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one technical / business management proposal over another.

It is DOE's intent to award the contract for each site to the offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. If an offeror submits proposals for both sites, the offeror must have adequate financial and technical resources and capability sufficient to support the work under both contracts.

#### OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

The proposals will be evaluated using information submitted by the offerors on the factors listed below.

Technical/business management approach is significantly more important than each of the other factors individually. However, the other factors when combined are more important than technical/business management approach.

Subfactors under technical/ business management approach are:  
Work planning, management and execution approach  
Key personnel

These subfactors are weighted equally.

Experience is somewhat more important than transition approach and ES&H.

Transition approach and ES&H are of equal importance but individually are more important than past performance.

Evaluation Criteria	Offeror Source
1 Technical/Business Management Approach	Written Information
2 Experience	Written Information and references
3 ES&H	Written Information
4 Transition Approach	Written Information
5 Past Performance	Written Information, questionnaires and references

## TECHNICAL / BUSINESS MANAGEMENT EVALUATION CRITERIA

The technical / business management proposal will be point scored and will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:

### Criterion 1: Technical/Business Management Approach

#### *Work planning, management and execution:*

The offeror's technical / business management proposal will be evaluated to determine the offeror's understanding of and ability to perform the requirements of the statement of work. DOE will evaluate the offeror's approach to the management and execution of contract work, including the overall approach and the likelihood that the approach will result in accomplishment of the work in a manner that fully meets all requirements.

#### *Key personnel:*

The offeror's key personnel will be evaluated on their education, relevant experience, qualifications, suitability to the proposed position, and demonstrated performance on work similar to that described in the statement of work.

**FAILURE TO SUBMIT COMMITMENT SIGNATURES AS STATED IN THE RESUME FORMAT IDENTIFIED IN THE ATTACHMENT TO SECTION L WILL RESULT IN THE OFFEROR'S RECEIVING A LOWER RATING FOR THIS CRITERION.**

### Criterion 2: Experience

DOE will evaluate the offeror's relevant experience in performing work similar in scope and complexity to that in the Statement of Work. For purposes of the experience evaluation, DOE will evaluate the experience of the offeror and its major subcontractors. In the case of a joint venture and/or LLC formed for the purpose of competing for this contract, DOE will evaluate the experience of each member.

### Criterion 3: Transition Approach

The offeror's proposal will be evaluated to determine if it identifies and demonstrates an understanding of the key issues involved in transition and effective strategies for managing those issues, including milestones and schedules. The transition approach will also be evaluated to

determine the effectiveness of the strategy for interacting with the incumbent contractor and its subcontractors as well as other onsite contractors and entities.

#### Criterion 4: Environment, Safety, and Health

The offeror's approach to developing, implementing and integrating an environment, safety and health program into work performance will be evaluated to ensure adequate protection for employees, the public, and the environment. The offeror's environment, safety and health and integrated safety management system approach will also be evaluated for effective strategies to assure accountability at all levels.

#### Criterion 5: Past Performance

The offeror's past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information furnished by the offeror's customers on contracts (including current contracts) similar in size, scope and to the work described in the Statement of Work. References other than those identified by the offeror, and other sources of information including the information requested in Section L, may also be used by the Government in evaluating this criterion. DOE may evaluate past performance on fewer than the total number of contracts if all the completed questionnaires are not returned. If the offeror does not have a record of relevant past performance information or if such information is not available, the offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably. The government will consider in its evaluation the relevance of the offeror's past performance information, the offeror's discussion of past performance problems, and the corrective actions taken to resolve those problems. DOE will evaluate the past performance of the major subcontractors, and in the case of a joint venture and/or LLC, the members of the newly formed entity.

### **M.3 Cost and Fee Evaluation Criteria**

(a) The DOE will evaluate each offeror's proposed cost (which includes transition costs) for realism, reasonableness and completeness. The evaluation of cost realism includes an analysis of specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost to determine whether the proposed estimated cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical proposal. The evaluation of cost reasonableness includes those considerations described in FAR subpart 31.2.

(b) The DOE will evaluate each offeror's proposed base and award fee. The following factors may be used when evaluating the base and award fee: contractor effort required to accomplish the contract work; contractor's willingness to assume risk as represented by the proportion of award fee to total base and award fee proposed; contractor contribution of capital investments, if any; and, contractor's ability to control costs on other similar government cost type contracts.

(c) The DOE will evaluate each offeror's estimated cost, fixed fee, base fee and award fee to ensure total contract costs and projected annual and total contract funding limitations are not exceeded.

(d) Based on its review, DOE will determine a most probable cost (which includes transition) to the Government to use for the evaluated cost. The offeror's most probable cost and proposed fixed, base and award fees will be combined to arrive at price for evaluation purposes.